arXiv:math/0701044v1 [math.CV] 1 Jan 2007

STABILITY AND IDENTITY OF ANALYTIC FUNCTIONS IN HARDY SPACES

DANG DUC TRONG AND TRUONG TRUNG TUYEN

1. Introduction

Let E be a subset of the unit disc U of the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. Throughout this paper, we assume that E consists of infinitively many points. We wish to reconstruct a function f in the Hardy space $H^p(U)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, when its value at any point in E is given. Recall that $H^p(U)$ is the space of all holomorphic functions g on U for which $\|g\|_p < \infty$, where

$$\|g\|_p = \lim_{r\uparrow 1}\left\{\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}|g(re^{i\theta})|^p d\theta\right\}^{1/p} \qquad (1 \leq p < \infty),$$
$$\|g\|_\infty = \lim_{r\uparrow 1}\sup_{\theta}|g(re^{i\theta})|.$$

For convenience, from now on, we will denote $H^p(U)$ by H^p.

As it is well known, this is an ill-posed problem. Clearly, the interpolation f is unique only if

(B): E contains a non-Blaschke sequence (z_j), that is, a sequence satisfying the condition

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}(1-|z_j|) = \infty.$$

Put

$$C_p(\varepsilon, R) = \sup\{\sup_{|z|\leq R}|g(z)| : g \in H^p,\ \|g\|_p \leq 1,\ |g(\zeta)| \leq \varepsilon\ \forall \zeta \in E\}, \tag{1.1}$$

for positive ε and R in $(0,1)$. It can be seen that $C_p(\varepsilon, R)$ is bounded from above by $(1-R^2)^{-1/p}$. We consider the stability of the problem in the sense that $C_p(\varepsilon, R)$ converges to 0 as ε decreases to 0. We also wish to establish the rate of convergence. In general, given only that E satisfies (B), it is impossible to say anything about the rate of convergence. However, the convergence itself can be attained.

Date: February 2, 2008.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30D15, 31A15, 44A10, 65F22.

Key words and phrases. Blaschke functions; Non-tangential limits.

Theorem 1. *If E satisfies (B), then*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} C_p(\varepsilon, R) = 0.$$

Remark 1. *When E does not satisfy (B), the conclusion of Theorem 1 is obviously false. As an example, consider the case E is the sequence $\{z_k\}$ where $\sum(1-|z_k|) < \infty$. Let g be the Blaschke product whose zeros are the points in E, $g(z) = \prod \frac{z_k - z}{1-\overline{z_k}z}\frac{|z_k|}{z_k}$. Then g is in H^∞, $\|g\|_\infty = 1$, $g(\zeta) = 0$ for all ζ in E, yet g is not identically zero in U.*

To estimate the rate of convergence, we need some other materials, especially, the properties of the set E. For example, if $p = \infty$ and E is a curve of a simply connected domain D, one might use the harmonic measure ω of E with respect to D to get $|f(z)| \le \varepsilon^{\omega(z)}$ inside D. Lately, in [3], Lavrent'ev, Romanov and Shishat-skii used a certain characteristic of the projection of E onto the real axis. They showed that if $E \subset D = \{z : |z| \le 1/4\}$ then $C_p(\varepsilon, R) \le \max\{\varepsilon^{4/25}, (6/7)^{n(\varepsilon)}\}$ for all $R \in (0, 1/4)$, in which $n(\varepsilon) \to \infty$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. This approach is quite interesting that E could be a sequence but must lye strictly inside U. Further, to our knowledge, all such estimates just give us the upper bounds. In this paper, we introduce some new quantities and then establish a quasi-polynomial two-side bound for $C_p(\varepsilon, R)$. We stress that the lower bound is also included in the estimate. Another advantage of this method is that the requirement that $\overline{E}$ lies inside Ucan be relaxed. In case $\overline{E} \subset U$, we get the following result

Theorem 2. *If $\overline{E} \subset U$ then there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ there is correspondingly a finite Blaschke product $B_\epsilon(z)$ whose zeros are in $\overline{E}$ satisfying*

$$\max_{|z|\le R} |B_\epsilon(z)| \le C_p(\epsilon, R) \le C \max_{|z|\le R} |B_\epsilon(z)|^{1/2},$$

where C is a positive constant that depends only on R and p. Moreover we have

$$\sup_{z\in E} |B_\epsilon(z)| \le \epsilon.$$

Closely related to the problem of stability of reconstructing analytic functions is the topic of identity of analytic functions. That is, under what conditions a bounded analytic function equals to zero identically. It is a classical result that if f is a function of class Nevalina and takes value zero on a non-Blaschke sequence, then f is the zero function. It is an interseting question to ask is there a lower bound for the fastness of tending to zero of analytic functions $|f(z)|$ when $|z| \to 1$ along E assuming that E is a set having $\overline{E} \cap \partial U \ne \emptyset$? Again, this question is trivial if E contains no non-Blaschke sequence. For the case E is a non-Blaschke sequence (not neccesary have limit points in ∂U) containing no limit point of itself, this question was thoroughly explored in [1] and [2] (see also [4]).

In particular, Danikas[1] and Hayman[2] proved that if (z_j) is a non-Blaschke sequence having no limit point of itself, there is a sequence of positive real numbers (η_j) such that if f is a bounded function and $|f(z_j)| \leq \eta_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ then $f \equiv 0$. It is natural to request that for sequences (η_j) having above described property, if z_k is a limit point of (z_j) then $\eta_k = 0$. So it is interesting that the results of Danikas and Hayman hold also for the general case of E being just a non-Blaschke sequence with no more constraint. Indeed, we shall prove the following

Theorem 3. *Assume that E is a non-Blaschke sequence (z_j). Then there exists a sequence of positive numbers (η_j) with the property that*

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \eta_j = 0,$$

such that if f is a non-zero bounded analytic funtion on U then

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty} \frac{|f(z_j)|}{\eta_j} = \infty.$$

Compared with results in [1] and [2], the sequence (η_j) in our paper is more explicitly constructed.

This paper consists of 5 parts. Some preliminary results and the proofs of Theorems 1 and 3 are presented in Section 2. In Section 3, we introduce some set functions and their properties. In Section 4 we prove main result Theorem 8 applicable to sets E satisfying fairly general conditions and apply it to prove Theorem 2. In Section 5 we gives some examples of sets E that illustrate some special cases of Theorem 8.

2. Preliminaries

Let us first introduce some notations and results that we are going to apply. In this section, we also give proofs of Theorems 1 and 3.

Let $Z_n = (z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n)$ be a sequence of n distinct points in U. By $B(Z_n, z)$ and $B_k(Z_n, z)$ we mean the products

$$B(Z_n, z) = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{z - z_j}{1 - \overline{z_j} z}, \qquad B_k(Z_n, z) = \prod_{1\leq j\neq k\leq n} \frac{z - z_j}{1 - \overline{z_j} z}. \tag{2.1}$$

The following theorem will be used.

Theorem 4. *If $Z_n = (z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n)$ is a sequence of n distinct points in U then, for all f in H^p and z in U, the following inequality holds:*

$$\left| f(z) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_k(Z_n, z) f(z_k) \right| \leq \frac{\|f\|_p}{(1 - |z|^2)^{\frac{1}{p}}} |B(Z_n, z)|, \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$c_{p,k}(Z_n,z)=\frac{1-|z_k|^2}{z-z_k}\left(\frac{1-\overline{z}z_k}{1-|z|^2}\right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}}\frac{B(Z_n,z)}{B_k(Z_n,z_k)}. \tag{2.3}$$

The reader is referred to [5] or [6] for proof of this Theorem.
We need some estimations of $B(Z_n,z)$ and $B_k(Z_n,z)$.

Proposition 1.

$$|B(Z_n,z)|\le \exp\left(-\frac{1-|z|^2}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(1-|z_j|)\right),$$

$$|B_k(Z_n,z)|\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{1-|z|^2}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(1-|z_j|)\right),$$

for z in $\overline{U}$ and Z_n in $\overline{U}^n$.

Proof. We need to estimate $\left|\dfrac{z-\zeta}{1-\overline{\zeta}z}\right|$ for z and ζ in U. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}1-\left|\frac{z-\zeta}{1-\overline{\zeta}z}\right|^2 &= \frac{(1-|z|^2)(1-|\zeta|^2)}{|1-\overline{\zeta}z|^2}\ge\frac{(1-|z|^2)(1-|\zeta|^2)}{(1+|\zeta|)^2}\\ &\ge\frac{(1-|z|^2)(1-|\zeta|)}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$1-\left|\frac{z-\zeta}{1-\overline{\zeta}z}\right|\ge\frac{(1-|z|^2)(1-|\zeta|)}{2\left(1+\left|\frac{z-\zeta}{1-\overline{\zeta}z}\right|\right)}\ge\frac{1-|z|^2}{4}(1-|\zeta|),$$

and thus,

$$\left|\frac{z-\zeta}{1-\overline{\zeta}z}\right|\le\exp\left(\left|\frac{z-\zeta}{1-\overline{\zeta}z}\right|-1\right)\le\exp\left(-\frac{1-|z|^2}{4}(1-|\zeta|)\right).$$

From this and the fact that $\exp\left(\dfrac{1-|z|^2}{4}(1-|z_k|)\right)\le 2$, we get the assertions. □

Now we prove Theorems 1 and 3.

Proof. of Theorem 1 Since E satisfies (B), there is a sequence $\{z_k\}$ of distinct points in E such that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(1-|z_k|)=\infty$.

Suppose that f is a function in H^p such that $\|f\|_1 \leq 1$ and $\max\limits_{\zeta\in E} f(\zeta) \leq \varepsilon$. An application of Theorem 4 to $Z_n = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ yields

$$|f(z)| \leq \left|\sum_{k=1}^{n} f(z_k)c_k(Z_n, z)\right| + \frac{\|f\|_1}{(1-|z|^2)^{\frac{1}{p}}}|B(Z_n, z)|, \qquad \forall z \in U.$$

It is clear that $c_k(Z_n, .)$ is continuous in U. As a consequence, we can find a constant M_n depending on the sequence $\{z_k\}$ so that $|c_k(Z_n, z)| \leq M_n$ for all $z \in U$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Therefore

$$|f(z)| \leq \varepsilon n M_n + \frac{1}{(1-|z|^2)^{\frac{1}{p}}}|B(Z_n, z)|, \qquad \forall z \in U,$$

and

$$C_p(\varepsilon, R) \leq \varepsilon n M_n + \frac{1}{(1-R^2)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \max_{z\in B(0,R)} |B(Z_n, z)|.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ gives

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} C_p(\varepsilon, R) \leq \frac{1}{(1-R^2)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \max_{z\in B(0,R)} |B(Z_n, z)|. \tag{2.4}$$

Hence to prove our assertion, it suffices to show that $\max\limits_{z\in B(0,R)} B(Z_n, z)$ tends to 0 as $n \to \infty$. Applying Proposition 1, one get

$$|B(Z_n, z)| \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1-|z|^2}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(1-|z_j|)\right).$$

Thus, since $\{z_k\}$ satisfies (B), $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \max\limits_{z\in B(0,R)} |B(Z_n, z)| = 0$. Hence, by passing (2.4) to limit, we obtain the desired result, $\lim\limits_{\varepsilon\to 0} C_p(\varepsilon, R) = 0$. □

Proof. of Theorem 3 From properties of E, we can choose a sequence of integers $n_1 < n_2 < ... < n_k < ...$ such that

$$\sum_{j=n_k}^{n_{k+1}-1} (1-|z_j|) \geq k.$$

It follows that $m_k = n_{k+1} - n_k \geq k$. We denote $Z_{k,m_k} = \{z_{n_k}, z_{n_k+1}, ..., z_{n_{k+1}-1}\}$. We define the sequence η_j as follows

$$\eta_j = \frac{|B_j(Z_{k,m(k)}, z_j)|}{m(k)},$$

if $n_k \leq j < n_{k+1}$. It is easy to see that $\eta_j \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$.

Now assume that f is a bounded analytic function satisfying

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty} \frac{|f(z_j)|}{\eta_j} < \infty,$$

we will show that $f \equiv 0$. Indeed, fixed $z \in U$ with $|z| \leq 1/2$. Applying Theorem 4 for Z_{k,m_k} and using Proposition 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z)| &\leq C(1+\sum_{j=n_k}^{n_{k+1}-1}\frac{|f(z_j)|}{m_k\eta_j})\max_{j=n_k,\ldots,n_{k+1}-1}|B_j(Z_{k,m_k},z)| \\ &\leq C\exp\{(-k+1)/4\}, \end{aligned}$$

for all k. So $f(z)=0$ for all $|z|\leq 1/2$. Hence $f\equiv 0$. □

3. Some set functions

For results of this section forward, we need the following definitions and results in [2].

Definition 5. *For each set E of U, we denote by E_0 the set of nontangential limit points of E, that is, points ζ of ∂U being such that there exists a sequence (z_n) in E which tends nontangentially to ζ, that is, such that*

$$z_n \to \zeta,\ |z_n-\zeta| = O(1-|z_n|).$$

Hayman proved the following theorem (see Theorem 1 in [2])

Theorem A *If the set E_0 of nontangential limit points of a set E has positive linear measure and if f is a bounded analytic function satisfying*

$$\lim_{z\in E,\ |z|\to 1} f(z)=0,$$

then $f\equiv 0$. Conversely, if E_0 has measure zero, then there exists $f(z)$, such that $0<|f(z)|<1$ in U, and satisfying

$$\lim_{z\in E,\ |z|\to 1} f(z)=0.$$

Hayman's Theorem suggests us to define the following geometric condition of E

(G): The set of nontangentially limit points E_0 of E has measure zero.

From now on we assume that E satisfies condition (G).

First, we define a new concept, the generalized Blaschke product, or the Blaschke product with respect to a function q. Let $q(z)$ be a function that satisfies properties of the function f in Theorem A. If $\overline{E}\cap\partial U=\emptyset$, we take $q\equiv 1$. We also normalize q so that $||q||_{\infty,U}=1$. Here we use the convention that a product which has no factor is 1. For $z\in\overline{U}$ and $Z_n\in\overline{U}^n$, we set

$$B_q(Z_n,z)=B(Z_n,z)q(z), \qquad B_{q,j}(Z_n,z)=B_j(Z_n,z)q(z). \tag{3.1}$$

The following result is easy to prove.

Proposition 2. *For all $R\in(0,1)$ and $Z_n\in U^n$, we have*

$$\max_{|z|\leq R}|B_q(Z_n,z)| \geq |q(0)|\prod_{1\leq j\leq n}\max\{R,|z_j|\}.$$

Denote by $d(.,.)$ the Gleason distance on U, $d(z_1, z_2) = \left|\dfrac{z_1 - z_2}{1 - \overline{z_2} z_1}\right|$. Let us introduce some definitions.

Definition 6. *For $Z_n = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in \overline{U}^n$, put*

$$V(Z_n) = \prod_{1\leq j\leq n} |B_q(Z_{j-1}, z_j)|, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\mu(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) = \sum_{1\leq j\leq n} |B_j(Z_n, z_j)|^{-1}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$M(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) = \sup_{z\in E} |B_q(Z_n, z)|. \tag{3.4}$$

Definition 7. *Let E be a subset of $\overline{U}$ which contains infinitively many points. Put*

$$V_n(E) = \sup_{Z_n\in E^n} V(Z_n), \tag{3.5}$$

$$\mu_n(E) = \inf_{Z_n\in E^n,\ V(Z_n)=V_n(E)} \mu(Z_n), \tag{3.6}$$

$$M_n(E) = \inf_{Z_n\in E^n,\ V(Z_n)=V_n(E)} M(Z_n). \tag{3.7}$$

If there is no confusing, we drop argument E and write V_n, M_n, μ_ninstead.

Remark 2. *If $V_n = V(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ then $z_j \in \overline{E} \cap U$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and $|B_{q,j}(Z_n, z_j)| = \sup_{z\in E} |B_{q,j}(Z_n, z)|$.*

Proposition 3. *Let $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n$ and $\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_{n+1}$ be points in $\overline{E}$ such that $V(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) = V_n$ and $V(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_{n+1}) = V_{n+1}$, then*

$$\mu(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_{n+1}) M(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \leq (n + 1)\|q\|_{\infty,E}.$$

Proof. If z_0 is the point in $\overline{E}$ such that $|B_q(Z_n, z_0)| = \prod_{1\leq j\leq n} d(z_0, z_j)|q(z)| = M(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$, then $M(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)V(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) = V(z_0, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \leq V_{n+1}$.

Therefore, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n+1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) &\leq \frac{V_{n+1}}{V(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)} \leq \frac{V(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_{n+1})}{V(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{k-1}, \zeta_{k+1}, \dots, \zeta_n)} \\ &= \prod_{1\leq j\neq k\leq n+1} d(\zeta_k, \zeta_j) q(\zeta_k) \leq \|q\|_{\infty,E} \prod_{1\leq j\neq k\leq n+1} d(\zeta_k, \zeta_j). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\mu(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_{n+1}) \leq \frac{(n + 1)\|q\|_{\infty,E}}{M(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)}.$$

This proves the proposition. □

Proposition 4. $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} V_n^{1/n} = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} M_n = 0.$

Proof. We need to consider only the case in which $\overline{E}$ intersect ∂U.

If $m \neq 0$. Fix a $\delta > 0$. By properties of $q(z)$, it follows that there exist an $r_\delta < 1$ such that $|z| < r_\delta$ whenever $z \in \overline{E}$ and $q(z) > \delta$. For each n, we rearrange $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n$ so that the first k_n elements have norm at least r_δ and the rest are not. We have

$$\begin{aligned} V_n &= \prod_{1\le j<l\le n} d(z_j, z_l) \prod_{1\le j\le n} |q(z_j)| \\ &\le \|q\|_{\infty,U}^{n-k_n} \prod_{k_n+1\le j<l\le n} d(z_j, z_l) \prod_{1\le j\le k_n} |q(z_j)| \le \|q\|_{\infty,U}^{n} \eta^{(n-k_n)(n-k_n-1)/2} \delta^{k_n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta = \frac{2r_\delta}{1+r_\delta^2}$. It follows that $V_n^{1/n} \le \|q\|_{\infty,U} \eta^{(n-k_n)(n-k_n-1)/2n} \delta^{k_n/n}$. From this, we see that, if $k_n/n \ge 1/3$, then $V_n^{1/n} \le \|q\|_{\infty,U}\delta^{1/3}$, and if $k_n/n < 1/3$, then $V_n^{1/n} \le \|q\|_{\infty,U}\eta^{n/9}$. Hence

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} V_n^{1/n} \le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \max\{\|q\|_{\infty,U}\delta^{1/3}, \|q\|_{\infty,U}\eta^{n/9}\} = \|q\|_{\infty,U}\delta^{1/3}.$$

Since δ can be chosen arbitrarily, we deduce $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} V_n^{1/n} = 0$.

To prove the second part of (iii), we choose $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n$ so that $M_n = M(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n)$. Noting that $|B_q(Z_n, z)| \le |B_{q,j}(Z_n, z)|$ and $|B_{q,j}(Z_n, z_j)| \le |B_{q,j}(Z_{j-1}, z_j)|$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} M_n = M(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n) = \sup_{z\in E} |B_q(Z_n, z)| &\le \left(\prod_{1\le j\le n} \sup_{z\in E} |B_{q,j}(Z_n, z)| \right)^{1/n} \\ \le \left(\prod_{1\le j\le n} |B_{q,j}(Z_n, z_j)| \right)^{1/n} &\le \left(\prod_{1\le j\le n} |B_q(Z_{j-1}, z_j)| \right)^{1/n} = V_n^{1/n}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to the convergence of M_n to 0. ☐

Now we assume following condition imposed on E: There exists a continuous function $h : [1, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ such that h is non-increasing, $\lim_{x\to\infty} h(x) = 0$ and $M_n \le h(n)$for all $n \in I\!N$. We can define such an h as follows: First, define $h(n) = \sup_{k\ge n} M_k$. Then $h(n+1) \le h(n)$, and by Lemma 4, we see that $\lim_{n\to\infty} h(n) = 0$. Then we extend it appropriately.

We take $\epsilon_0 = \dfrac{h(1)}{2}$. Since $\dfrac{h(x)}{x+1}$ is continuous and strictly decreasing, and $\lim_{x\to\infty} h(x) = 0$, we can define a function $\varphi : (0, \epsilon_0) \to (0, \infty)$ as follows:

$$\varphi(\epsilon) = h(x) \text{ iff } \epsilon = \frac{h(x)}{x+1}.$$

We note that φ is non-decreasing and $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \varphi(\epsilon) = 0$.

The following result is used for proving results in Section 4

Lemma 1. *If R is a real number in $(0,1)$, then there exists a positive number α depending on R such that for all r in $[0,1]$, the inequality underneath holds,*

$$\max\{R^\alpha, r^\alpha\} \ge \frac{R+r}{1+Rr}. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. First, we consider the case $r \le R$. We have $\max\{R^\alpha, r^\alpha\} = R^\alpha$ and $\dfrac{R+r}{1+Rr} \le \dfrac{2R}{1+R^2}$. Thus, if this is the case, we must choose α in such a way that $0 < \alpha \le \dfrac{\ln(2R) - \ln(1+R^2)}{\ln R}$.

Finally, we consider the case $r > R$. The inequality (3.8) is now equivalent to $\dfrac{r^\alpha - r}{1 - r^{\alpha+1}} \ge R$. We will show that the function $f(r) = \dfrac{r^\alpha - r}{1 - r^{\alpha+1}}$ $(R \le r \le 1)$ attains its absolute minimum at R. We have $f'(r) = \dfrac{r^{2\alpha} - \alpha r^{\alpha+1} + \alpha r^{\alpha-1} - 1}{(1-r^{\alpha+1})^2}$. Put $g(r) = r^{2\alpha} - \alpha r^{\alpha+1} + \alpha r^{\alpha-1} - 1$ $(R \le r \le 1)$, then $g'(r) = 2\alpha r^{2\alpha-1} - \alpha(1+\alpha)r^\alpha - \alpha(1-\alpha)r^{\alpha-2}$. By Holder inequality, one has $(1+\alpha)r^{1-\alpha} + \alpha(1-\alpha)r^{-(1+\alpha)} \ge 2r^{(1-\alpha)(1+\alpha)}r^{-(1+\alpha)(1-\alpha)} = 2$ if $0 < r < 1$. This shows that $g(r) \le 0$ and thus $g(r) \ge g(1) = 0$. As a consequence, $f(r) \ge f(R) = \dfrac{R^\alpha - R}{1 - R^{\alpha+1}}$.

Therefore, the proof of the lemma is complete once we can show that for sufficiently small α the inequality $f(R) \ge R$ holds. Indeed, this is equivalent to $R^{\alpha-1} + R^{\alpha+1} \ge 2$. Since $0 < R < 1$, it follows that $R^{-1} + R^1 > 2$. Hence, choosing α small enough will lead to the desired result. □

4. Main result

Theorem 8. *Let E be a subset of U satifying condition (G). Let φ be the function defined in last part of Section 3. Then, there exists a positive number ε_0 and a non-decreasing function $g_R : (0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying*

(i) $\lim\limits_{\varepsilon\to 0} g_R(\varepsilon) = 0$ *if E satisfies (B).*

(ii) $(g_R(\varepsilon))^{[k]+1} \le g_R(\varepsilon^\kappa) \le (g_R(\varepsilon))^{\frac{1}{[1/\kappa]+1}}$ *for positive κ.*

such that

$$g_R(\varepsilon) \le C_p(\varepsilon, R) \le C g_R(\varphi(\varepsilon)) \qquad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0). \tag{4.1}$$

In particular, if there are constants C and N and $\sigma > 0$ such that $M_n(E) \le Cn^{-\sigma}$ for $n \ge N$ then

$$g_R(\varepsilon) \le C_p(\varepsilon, R) \le C g_R(\varepsilon)^{\frac{\alpha}{[1/\kappa_0]+1}} \qquad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \tag{4.2}$$

where α depends on R and σ.

Proof. of Theorem 8 (Part 1: Existence of g) In this part, we prove the existence of g_R and show that it satisfies the inequality $g_R(\varepsilon) \le C_p(\varepsilon, R)$ and the two properties (i), (ii).

For R in $(0,1)$, we construct the function $g_R : (0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^+$ as follows

$$g_R(\varepsilon) = \sup \left\{ \frac{\prod\limits_{1\le j\le n} \max\{R^s, |z_j|^s\}}{\|q\|^s_{\infty,U}} : s, n \in \mathbb{N}, Z_n \in E^n, \frac{M^s(Z_n)}{\|q\|^s_{\infty,U}} \le \varepsilon \right\}, \tag{4.3}$$

where M is defined as in Section 3.

It can be derived from Proposition 1 that $\dfrac{M^s(Z_n)}{\|q\|^s_{\infty,U}} \le \exp\left(-s(1-|z_0|^2)\sum\limits_{k=1}^{n}(1-|z_k|)\right)$ for some z_0 in $\overline{E}$. Thus g_R is well-defined.

1. $g_R(\varepsilon) \le C_p(\varepsilon, R)$.

   Let $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n$ be in $\overline{E}$ such that $M^s(Z_n) \le \varepsilon\|q\|^s_{\infty,U}$, then the function $h(z) = \dfrac{1}{\|q\|^s_{\infty,U}} B^s_q(Z_n, z)$ satisfies $|h(z)| \le \varepsilon$ for $z \in E$ and $|h(z)| \le 1$ for $z \in U$. Hence $\sup\limits_{|z|\le R} |h(z)| \le C_p(\varepsilon, R)$. On the other hand, in view of Proposition 2, we have $\sup\limits_{|z|\le R} |h(z)| \ge \dfrac{1}{\|q\|^s_{\infty,U}} \prod\limits_{1\le j\le n} \max\{R^s, |z_j|^s\}$. This implies that $g_R(\varepsilon) \le C_p(\varepsilon, R)$.
2. $\lim\limits_{\varepsilon\to 0} g_R(\varepsilon) = 0$ if E satisfies (B).

   This assertion follows from 1. and Theorem 1.
3. $(g_R(\varepsilon))^{[k]+1} \le g_R(\varepsilon^\kappa) \le (g_R(\varepsilon))^{\frac{1}{[1/\kappa]+1}}$ for positive κ.

   It is clear that, for arbitrary ε in $(0,1)$, $M^s(Z_n) \le \|q\|^s_{\infty,U}\varepsilon^\kappa$ implies immediately that $M^{s([1/\kappa]+1)}(Z_n) \le \|q\|^{s([1/\kappa]+1)}_{\infty,U}\varepsilon$. Therefore, $g_R(\varepsilon^\kappa) \le (g_R(\varepsilon))^{\frac{1}{[1/\kappa]+1}}$.

   Similarly, we get $g_R(\varepsilon) \le (g_R(\varepsilon^\kappa))^{\frac{1}{[\kappa]+1}}$. Hence $g_R(\varepsilon^\kappa) \ge (g_R(\varepsilon))^{[\kappa]+1}$.

This ends part 1. □

Remark 3. *For two different chooses* $q(z) = q_1(z)$ *and* $q(z) = q_2(z)$*, it is not expected that* $g_1(\epsilon) = g_2(\epsilon)$*. But* $g_1(\epsilon)$ *and* $g_2(\epsilon)$*are still related to each other, since according to Theorem 8 we have*

$$g_1(\epsilon) \le C_p(\epsilon) \le Cg_2(\varphi_2(\epsilon)).$$

Here we droped indices R *in functions* g_1, g_2 *and* C_p.

In particular, if there are constants C *and* N *and* $\sigma > 0$ *such that* $M_n(E) \le Cn^{-\sigma}$ *for* $n \ge N$ *then we can bound* g_1 *by a positive power of* g_2.

Theorem 4 provides a way to investigate $C_p(\varepsilon, R)$, that is to estimate $D_p(\varepsilon, R)$ which will be defined underneath.

Definition 9. *For* $Z_n = (z_1,\, z_2,\, \ldots,\, z_n) \in E^n$*, put*

$$D_p(\varepsilon, R, Z_n) = \sup_{|z|\le R}\left(\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{n} |c_k(Z_n, z)| + \frac{1}{(1-|z|^2)^{\frac{1}{p}}}|B(Z_n, z)|\right). \tag{4.4}$$

The infimum of $D_p(\varepsilon, R, Z_n)$ *while* Z_n *varies in* E^n *is defined to be* $D_{p,n}(\varepsilon, R)$*,*

$$D_{p,n}(\varepsilon, R) = \inf_{Z_n\in E^n} D(\varepsilon, R, Z_n). \tag{4.5}$$

Finally, set

$$D_p(\varepsilon, R) = \inf_{n\in \mathbb{N}} D_{p,n}(\varepsilon, R). \tag{4.6}$$

Recall that

$$c_{p,k}(Z_n, z) = \frac{1-|z_k|^2}{z-z_k}\left(\frac{1-\overline{z}z_k}{1-|z|^2}\right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}} \frac{B(Z_n, z)}{B_k(Z_n, z_k)}.$$

We have

$$D_p(\varepsilon, R, Z_n) \le CE(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n)(\varepsilon\mu(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n) + 1),$$

where $E(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n) = \displaystyle\prod_{k=1}^{n} \frac{R+|z_k|}{1+|z_k|R}$.

Proof. of Theorem 8 (Part 2: finished) It follows from Lemma 1 that

$$D_{p,n}(\varepsilon, R) \le C \prod_{1\le j\le n} \max\{R^\alpha, |\zeta_j|^\alpha\}(\varepsilon\mu(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \ldots, \zeta_n) + 1), \tag{4.7}$$

where $\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \ldots, \zeta_n$ are defined by $V(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \ldots, \zeta_n) = V_n(E)$ and $M_n(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \ldots, \zeta_n) = M_n(E)$. Note that these ζ_j is contained in U. For simplicity, we denote by μ_n^* the quantity $\mu(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \ldots, \zeta_n)$.

It follows from Proposition 4 that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} M_n(E) = 0$. Thus, we can choose the smallest n_0 such that $M_{n_0}(E) \le \varphi(\varepsilon) < M_{n_0-1}(E)$ for all ε less than some fixed constant ε_0. Then, by Proposition 3

$$M_{n_0}(E) \le \varphi(\varepsilon) < M_{n_0-1}(E) \le \frac{n_0\|q\|_{\infty,E}}{\mu_{n_0}^*}.$$

On the other hand, we have $\varphi(\epsilon) < M_{n_0-1}(E) \le h(n_0-1)$ for $n_0 \ge N$. This gives $n_0 \le x+1$, where

$$\epsilon = \frac{h(x)}{x+1}.$$

Hence,

$$\epsilon\mu_{n_0}^* = \frac{\epsilon}{\varphi(\epsilon)}\varphi(\epsilon)\mu_{n_0}^* \le \frac{\epsilon}{\varphi(\epsilon)}n_0 \le \frac{\epsilon}{\varphi(\epsilon)}(x+1) = \frac{\frac{h(x)}{x+1}}{h(x)}(x+1) = 1.$$

Now, noting that $\|q\|_{\infty,U} \geq 1$, it is deduced that $M(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \ldots, \zeta_{n_0}) = M_{n_0}(\overline{E}) \leq \varphi(\varepsilon) \leq \varphi(\varepsilon)\|q\|_{\infty,U}$. This yields

$$\prod_{1\leq j\leq n} \max\{R, |\zeta_j|\} \leq \|q\|_{\infty,U}\, g_R(\varphi(\varepsilon)).$$

Thus, the assertion of the theorem follows.

To prove for the case $M_n \leq Cn^{-\sigma}$ we see that $h(x) = Cx^{-\sigma}$. So we have

$$\varphi(\epsilon) = h(x) = Cx^{-\sigma} \leq C_2 \epsilon^{\sigma/(1+\sigma)},$$

since $\epsilon = Cx^{-\sigma}(1+x)^{-1}$. Now apply property (ii) of g we get the result.

□

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2.

Proof. of Theorem 2 Since $\overline{E} \subset U$ we can take $q \equiv 1$. We can assume that E is closed. From the assumption, we get that $M_n(E) \leq (\dfrac{2r}{1+r})^n$. So the function $\varphi(\epsilon)$ in Theorem 8 satisfies

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{\log \epsilon}{\log \varphi(\epsilon)} = 1. \tag{4.8}$$

If we put

$$\widetilde{g}_p(\epsilon, R) = \sup\{\max_{|z|\leq R} |B(Z_n, z)| :\ n \in I\!N,\ Z_n \in E^n,\ \max_{z\in E} |B(Z_n, z)| \leq \epsilon\},$$

then it follows from the proof of Theorem 8 that there exist $C,\ \epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ we have

$$\widetilde{g}_p(\epsilon, R) \leq C_p(\epsilon, R) \leq C\widetilde{g}_p(\epsilon, R)^{1/(1+[\log(\varphi(\epsilon))/\log \epsilon])}. \tag{4.9}$$

Indeed, to prove the left-hand side of this inequality we can use the definition of $C_p(\epsilon, R)$, while for the right-hand side we use Theorem 8 and the property that

$$g_p(\epsilon, R) \leq \widetilde{g}_p(\epsilon, R).$$

From (4.8) we can write (4.9) such as

$$\widetilde{g}_p(\epsilon, R) \leq C_p(\epsilon, R) \leq C\widetilde{g}_p(\epsilon, R)^{1/2}.$$

Since E is compact, there exist $n \in I\!N$ and $Z_n \in E^n$ such that

$$\widetilde{g}_p(\epsilon, R) = \max_{|z|\leq R} |B(Z_n, z)|.$$

So we get the conclusion of Theorem 2. □

5. Some examples

In this Section we gives some examples of sets satisfying the special case $M_n \le Cn^{-\sigma}$ of Theorem 8. The criteria given in this Section are fairly easy to verify.

Proposition 5. *Assume that E is contained in some Stolz angles. Then there exist σ, C and $N > 0$ such that $M_n(E) \le Cn^{-\sigma}$ for $n \ge N$.*

Proof. Let $\overline{E} \cap \partial U = \{a_1, a_2, ..., a_n\}$. We take in this case $q(z) = (z-a_1)(z-a_2)...(z-a_n)$.

We seperate the proof into three steps.

1. Suppose that $\overline{E}$ lies inside U. In this case $M_n \le n^{-\sigma}$ for sufficiently large n.
2. Suppose that $\overline{E} \cap \partial U$ has only one point. By mean of some rotation, we may assume that it this point is 1.

   We have $q(z) = z - 1$. We see that if $|q(z)| > \delta > 0$ for some z in E, then $|z| < r_\delta = 1 - c\delta$ where c is a constant depending on the Stolz angle with vertex at 1. Refering to the proof of Proposition 4, we get

   $$V_n^{1/n} \le C \max\{\delta^{1/3}, \eta^{n/9}\}. \tag{5.1}$$

   Choosing $\delta = n^{-3\sigma}$ ($\sigma \in (0, 1/6)$), we have

   $$\eta = \frac{2r_\delta}{1+r_\delta^2} = \frac{2(1-cn^{-3\sigma})}{1+(1-cn^{-3\sigma})^2} = \frac{2n^{6\sigma}-2cn^{3\sigma}}{2n^{6\sigma}-2cn^{3\sigma}+c^2}.$$

   Hence,

   $$\begin{aligned}\eta^{n/9} &= \left(\frac{2n^{6\sigma}-2cn^{3\sigma}}{2n^{6\sigma}-2cn^{3\sigma}+c^2}\right)^{n/9} = \left(1-\frac{c^2}{2n^{6\sigma}-2cn^{3\sigma}+c^2}\right)^{n/9} \\ &\le \left(1-\frac{c^2}{2n^{6\sigma}}\right)^{\frac{2n^{6\sigma}}{c^2}\frac{c^2n^{1-6\sigma}}{18}} \le \exp\left(-\frac{c^2n^{1-6\sigma}}{18}\right) \le n^{-\sigma}\end{aligned}$$

   for sufficiently large n. Combining with (5.1), the assertion follows.
3. Now, consider the general case. It suffices to show that if E_1 and E_2 are two sets satisfy $V_n^{1/n}(E_i) \le Cn^{-\sigma_i}$ for $n \ge N$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $E = E_1 \cup E_2$, then $V_n^{1/n}(E) \le Cn^{-\sigma}$, for $n \ge 2N$ and $\sigma = \min\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}/2$. We take $q(z) = q_1(z)q_2(z)$where q_1, q_2 are coressponding $q's$ functions of E_1, E_2. Fix an $n \ge 2N$ and suppose that $V_n(E) = V(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_l, \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \ldots, \zeta_k)$ for $z_j \in E_1$, $\zeta_j \in E_2$, and $n = l + k$. It follows from definitions that

   $$V_n^{1/n}(E) \le V_l^{1/n}(E_1)V_k^{1/n}(E_2).$$

   We may assume that $l \ge k$. It implies that $l \ge n/2 \ge N$. If $k \le N$, we have

   $$V_n^{1/n}(E) \le CV_l^{1/n}(E_1) \le Cl^{-\sigma_1 l/n} \le C(n/2)^{-\sigma_1/2} \le Cn^{-\sigma}.$$

If $k \geq N$, we have

$$V_n^{1/n}(E) \leq V_l^{1/n}(E_1)V_k^{1/n}(E_2) \leq Cl^{-\sigma_1 l/n}k^{-\sigma_2 k/n} \leq C\left(l^{-l/n}k^{-k/n}\right)^{-\sigma}$$
$$= Cn^{-\sigma}\left((l/n)^{-l/n}(k/n)^{-k/n}\right)^{-\sigma} \leq Cn^{-\sigma}.$$

Here we have used the inequality $x^x(1-x)^{1-x} \geq 1/2$ for all $x \in (0,1)$. The proof is complete. □

To find a more sophisticated example, we use the construction used in [2]. For convenience, we recall some definitions that Hayman used in constructing the function f in Theorem A.

Definition 10. *Let E satisfy (G). We write*

$$E' = \{z = re^{i\theta} : \ |\theta - \phi| < 1 - r \ \text{and} \ re^{i\phi} \in E\}.$$

Next, for $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$, we define

$$\rho(\theta) = \sup\{\rho : \ 0 \leq \rho < 1, \ \rho e^{i\theta} \in E'\}.$$

Let E_∞ be the set of θ such that $\rho(\theta) = 1$. If $\theta \in E_\infty$ then $e^{i\theta} \in E_0$. So $m(E_\infty) = 0$, where $m(.)$ is the Lebesgue's measure of the unit circle.

For each $1 > r > 0$ let E_r be the set of all θ such that $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$ and $\rho(\theta) > r$. Then E_r are open and contract with increasing r, and

$$\bigcap_r E_r = E_\infty.$$

Thus

$$\lim_{r\to 1} m(E_r) = 0.$$

Considering carefully the construction in the proof of Theorem 1 in [2] and Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 5 we can show that if the quantities $m(E_r)$ tend to 0 sufficiently fast, then $M_n \leq Cn^{-\sigma}$. In particular, this claim is true if the following condition is satisfied

$$m(E_\delta) \leq \frac{1}{-2\log\epsilon} \text{ if } \delta = 1 - K\sqrt{-\epsilon\log\epsilon},$$

where K is a positive constant. In fact, if this condition holds, the function f is constructed in Theorem 1 in [2] will satisfy: if $|f(z)| > \epsilon$ then $|z| \leq 1 - K\sqrt{-\epsilon\log\epsilon}$.

References

[1] N. Danikas, *On an identity theorem in Nevalina class*, J. Appros. Theory 77 (1994), 184-190.

[2] W. K. Hayman, *Identity theorems for functions of bounded characteristic*, J. London Math. Soc.,(2) 58 (1998), 127-140.

[3] M. M. Lavrent'ev, V. G. Romanov, S. P. Shishat-skii, *Ill-posed problems of mathematical Physics and Analysis*, Transl. Amer. Math. Soc. (1986).

[4] Yuril I. Lyubarskii and Kristian Seip, *A uniqueness theorem for bounded analytic functions*, Bull. London Math. Soc.,29 (1997), 49-52.

[5] K. Yu. Osipenko, *Best approximation of analysis functions from information about their values at a finite number of points*, Math. Zametki,19 (1976), 29-40.
[6] D. D. Trong, N. L. Luc, L. Q. Nam, T. T. Tuyen, *Reconstruction of H^p-functions: Best approximation, regularization and optimal error estimate*, Complex Variables, Vol 49, no.4, 2004, 285-301.

Dang Duc Trong, Department of Mathematics, Hochiminh City National University, 227 Nguyen Van Cu, Q5, HoChiMinh City, Vietnam
E-mail address: `ddtrong@mathdep.hcmuns.edu.vn`

Truong Trung Tuyen, Department of Mathematics, Hochiminh City National University, 227 Nguyen Van Cu, Q5, HoChiMinh City, Vietnam
E-mail address: `truongtrungtuyen2005@yahoo.com`